

REMARKS

Claims 3, 5 to 11, 13 and 15 to 20 are pending in this application of which claims 5 and 15 are independent claims. Pursuant to a conversation with Examiner Cunningham on May 8, 2003, the Examiner has indicated that he agrees to the proposed amendment sent to him on May 7, 2003. The Examiner suggested and further agrees to having claims 3 and 13 dependent on claims 5 and 15 respectively. Pursuant to the agreement of the amendment by the Examiner, the application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner would allow claims 5 to 11 and 15 to 20 if the specification rejections were addressed and the claims included the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, the Applicants addressed the specification rejections described below and incorporated the respective base claims into claim 5 and 15. Further, Applicants modified the original wording of claims 5 and 15, not to add further limitations, but for brevity.

Turning first to the specification issues, the Examiner has interpreted the added statement, "Another output" as referring to an additional output to the multifunctional pump. This was not the Applicants' intent. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the specification to clearly specify that the voltage refers to the voltage output of the multifunctional pump system. This is supported by FIGS. 1, 3 and 4 and throughout the specification (e.g., page 9 lines 5 to 10).

In claim 1, the Examiner has indicated that there is no support for the multifunction pump that is "configured to provide more than two voltages" because the multifunctional pump provides only one output. The Examiner is correct in stating the multifunctional pump has only

one output, but that one output, IN_2 , provides multiple voltages. However, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to distinctly recite that the multifunctional pump provides more than two voltage levels. As recited in the specification, “the multifunctional pump slews from a read level voltage (e.g., 5 volts (V)) to a program level voltage (e.g., 7 V) and back down to a verify level voltage (e.g., 5V)” (see page 3 line 2 to 4).

In claim 5, the Examiner does not understand how an apparatus recitation can further limit a method. Applicants submit that since claim 5 is now an independent claim, the rejection becomes moot.

In claims 7 to 10 and 17 to 20, the Examiner has rejected each claim because it is not clear to the Examiner how the multifunctional pump can have a standby mode (claims 7 and 17), a read mode (claims 8 and 18), a program mode (claims 9 and 19), or a stand-by mode (claims 10 and 20). Applicants submit that these terms have been defined in the specification and their use is clear to one skilled in the art. For example, these modes occur depending on how each array is enabled (see page 4 line 20 to page 5 line 5).

In claim 11, the Examiner has indicated that there is no support for the multifunction pump that is “configured to provide more than two voltages” because the multifunctional pump provides only one output. As in claim 1, the Applicants have amended claim 11 to distinctly recite that the multifunctional pump provides more than two voltage levels.

Further, the Examiner has indicated that it is not clear how the first comparator can provide the recited operation in claim 11 because the claim allegedly fails to discuss how the feedback voltage is generated. The Applicants have amended claim 11 to distinctly specify the source of the feedback voltage is received from the transistor.

Applicant : Raymond W. Zeng et al.

Serial No. : 10/056,657

Filed : October 19, 2001

Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-524001

Intel Corporation Docket No.: P12428

All correspondence should be directed to the above address. Applicant's attorney can be reached by telephone at the number shown above.